



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/735,751 | 12/16/2003 | Takashi Fukui | Q78693 | 3362 |

23373 7590 08/23/2004

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

BOWER, KENNETH W

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

3653

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/735,751

Applicant(s)

FUKUI, TAKASHI

Examiner

Kenneth W Bower

Art Unit

3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 11-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/16/2003.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 15 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 15 recites limitations already recited in claim 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 11-15 (as understood) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer or Boise in view of Morita.

Palmer discloses drum (70), shaft (92), scan exposure (column 1, lines 25-45), leading edge chuck (126) and trailing edge chuck (128) cylindrical surface and periphery (Fig. 1).

Boise discloses drum (10), shaft (Fig. 2A), scan exposure (column 1, lines 13-165), leading edge chuck and trailing edge chuck (column 3, lines 4-10) cylindrical surface and periphery (Fig. 1).

Palmer and Boise lack a skeletal structure having a plurality of wide cylindrical supports separated by an interval narrower than the cylindrical supports.

Morita discloses a skeletal structure having a plurality of wide cylindrical supports separated by an interval narrower than the cylindrical supports at Fig. 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Palmer or Boise with the teaching of Morita to reduce the cost of manufacture of the drum as suggested by Morita at Column 3, lines 27-30.

The reason for combination of the claims is considered to meet the claimed requirement because it is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. *In re Litner*, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972); *In re Dillon*, 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ2d 1897 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. Denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991)


Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
5. Direct any inquiry concerning this or earlier communications from the examiner to Kenneth W. Bower at ken.bower@uspto.gov or (703) 306-4546. Call the examiner immediately prior to sending an unofficial fax to (703) 308-0552 or (703) 308-2571 if fax is busy. The examiner is normally available from 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM Eastern Time on Monday through Thursday and on every second Friday. The official central facsimile number for all groups is (703) 872-9306. Status or general information queries should be directed to the Group Receptionist at (703) 308-1113. If necessary, the Group Receptionist can assist with contacting the examiner's supervisor.

Kenneth W. Bower
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3653



Kwb
08/18/2004



DONALD P. HALC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600